



Supreme Court of California
350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102-4797
www.courts.ca.gov/supremecourt

NEWS RELEASE

Contact: [Cathal Conneely](mailto:Cathal.Conneely@courts.ca.gov), 415-865-7740

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

November 15, 2013

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of November 11, 2013

[This news release is issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The statement of the issue or issues in each case set out below does not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]

#13-97 *B.H. v. County of San Bernardino*, S213066. (E054516; nonpublished opinion; San Bernardino County Superior Court; CIVDS913403.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issues: (1) Does Penal Code section 11166, subdivision (k), create a mandatory duty requiring a law enforcement agency to cross-report to the relevant social services agency whenever it receives a report of known or suspected child abuse? (2) If so, when is that duty triggered? (3) Does Penal Code section 11166, subdivision (a), apply to law enforcement agencies that receive initial reports of child abuse? (4) If so, what standard should be applied to determine whether a follow-up report is required?

#13-98 *City of Perris v. Stamper*, S213468. (E053395; 218 Cal.App.4th 1104; Riverside County Superior Court; RIC524291.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issues: (1) In this eminent domain case, was the constitutionality of the dedication requirement — that the city claimed it would have required in order to grant the property owner permission to put the property to a higher use — a question that had to be resolved by the jury pursuant to article I, section 19, of the California Constitution? (2) Was the dedication requirement a “project effect” that the eminent domain law required to be ignored in determining just compensation?

DISPOSITIONS

The following cases were transferred for reconsideration in light of *Reilly v. Superior Court* (2013) 57 Cal.4th 641:

- #12-62 *Boysel v. Superior Court*, S202324.**
- #12-64 *Wright v. Superior Court*, S202320.**
- #12-72 *Chambers v. Superior Court*, S202334.**
- #12-73 *Gordon v. Superior Court*, S202322.**
- #12-74 *Lefort v. Superior Court*, S202311.**
- #12-75 *Lunday v. Superior Court*, S202366.**
- #12-76 *Quintero v. Superior Court*, S202358.**
- #12-77 *Rigby v. Superior Court*, S202314.**
- #12-78 *Smith v. Superior Court*, S202338.**
- #12-79 *Yancy v. Superior Court*, S202359.**
- #12-95 *Macy v. Superior Court*, S204255.**

#

The Supreme Court of California is the state's highest court and its decisions are binding on all other California state courts. The court's primary role is to decide matters of statewide importance and to maintain uniformity in the law throughout California by reviewing matters from the six districts of the California Courts of Appeal and the fifty-eight county superior courts (the trial courts). Among its other duties, the court also decides all capital appeals and related matters and reviews both attorney and judicial disciplinary matters.